

Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

BIBLICAL STUDIES.

I.—The Last Chapter of Zechariah.

I HAVE discovered, I believe, an episode hitherto quite unknown or unnoticed in the Persian post-Exilic period of Jewish history, which, coming to me as a surprise, I propose to submit to competent critics for examination. The first three Kings of Persia, Cyrus, Darius, and Artaxerxes I. (ארתחשסתא), treated the Jews favourably. Cyrus gave the exiles permission to return from Babylon and rebuild Jerusalem and the Temple. Darius encouraged them in the work of restoring the ancient fane, which took twenty years to complete. Artaxerxes I.'s marked cordiality to Ezra and Nehemiah, enabled them to vanquish the foes of Jerusalem, and to raise the commonwealth of Judæa from its prostrate condition to one of comparative prosperity. All these circumstances intensify our surprise at the opposite policy Artaxerxes III. pursued towards his Jewish subjects. When this monarch, surnamed Ochus, conducted a campaign against Egypt, he carried away a portion of the inhabitants of Judæa into captivity. Some of the exiles he settled at Hyrcanium, on the Caspian Sea; the rest in Babylon. Syncellus, the Byzantine writer, to whom we are indebted for an account of this persecution, states that it was originally derived from Greek writers, of whom the chief was probably Diodorus Siculus, in that book, of which only a fragment is extant, where he speaks of the Jews.[1] Syncellus' immediate source was certainly

[1] *Syncellus*, p. 481, 10. Ὄχος Ἀρταξέρξου παῖς εἰς Αἴγυπτον στρατεύων μικρὴν αἰχμαλωσίαν εἵλεν Ἰουδαίων, ὧν τοὺς μὲν ἐν Ὑρκανίᾳ κατῴκισε πρὸς τῇ Κασπίᾳ Θαλάσσῃ, τοὺς δὲ ἐν Βαβυλῶνι, οἱ καὶ μέχρι νῦν εἰσιν αὐτόθι,

Eusebius' chronicle, which we unfortunately no longer possess in the original. Its notice of this Jewish Exile has, however, been preserved by Jerome and the Armenian Translation. Jerome quotes from Eusebius to the following effect: "Ochus Apodasmo[1] Judæorum capta in Hyrcaniam accolas translatos juxta mare Caspium conlocavit" (*Olympiad*, 105). The Armenian version, recast into Latin, reads similarly: "Ochus partem aliquam de Romanis[2] Judæisque cepit et habitare fecit in Hyrcania juxta Mare Cazbium." Other historical evidence, which will presently be given, also shows that the Jews suffered under the last Persian kings. Strange as this persecution appears, still stranger is it that it is not mentioned in the Book of Chronicles, which was composed after this period. One of the prophetical books, however, contains, I fancy, a reference to it. This conjecture I will now submit to a critical examination.

All critics and commentators have hitherto regarded the last chapter of Zechariah as a continuation of the preceding two chapters, with which it is supposed to form one integral prophecy (Ch. xiii., vv. 7-9, belong to ch. xi., and are, of course, excepted). On the ground that the existence of the royal house of David is assumed in chaps. xii. and xiii., and even the prevalence of idolatry in Palestine is implied in ch. xiii., these two chapters—and ch. xiv. with them—have been assigned to the pre-Exilic period. But this intimate connection between the last chapter of Zechariah and the two preceding chapters presents serious difficulties.

1. The twelfth chapter contains only a fugitive reference

ὡς πολλοὶ τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἱστορούσιν. The whole account of the transportation of the Jews and of their stay in their lands of exile till Syncellus' time, must have been derived from "the many Greek writers" to whom he refers at the end of his book.

[1] *Apodasmo Judæorum capta* is unintelligible. Perhaps we should read: *Ochus Artaxerxes urbe Judæorum capta.*

[2] *De Romanis* is meaningless. The original may have read *de Idumæis*, altered by the translator into *Romanis.*

to the siege of Jerusalem. The fourteenth describes it in all its dreadful details. The city is captured; the houses are destroyed; the women dishonoured; the wealth of the capital becomes the invaders' spoil, and one-half of the inhabitants are carried away into captivity. If both chapters refer to the same event, the prophecy should have begun with the description of the siege, given in ch. xiv., which is far more dramatic than the short sentence, "I shall make of Jerusalem a cup of confusion for all the nations."

2. The faint resemblance between these two prophecies vanishes on a close examination. The former prophecy predicts, indeed, the siege of Jerusalem; but adds, however, that the city will sustain no injury. It will become "a burdensome stone for all the peoples; all that burden themselves with it shall be sore wounded." This means, in plain words, that Jerusalem will successfully withstand the efforts of its foes to capture it. The second passage, however, says that the capital will be conquered, and describes the dire results of such a catastrophe—the reckless destruction of property, the violation of women, and the exile of a portion of the inhabitants. How can utterances so different have been linked together in one prophecy?

3. In ch. xiv. the boundaries of the land are very narrowly circumscribed. The northern extremity only reaches to Geba of Benjamin. The passage runs as follows: Living waters shall go out of Jerusalem. . . . All the land will be surrounded (by them), as Araba (the bed of the Jordan) from Geba to Rimmon, south of Jerusalem."[1]

[1] Ch. xiv. 10. has been quite misunderstood by ancient and modern exegetists, who have taken it to mean that the situation of the country will be changed. So Rashi, following the Tosefta, Ewald, and all the recent commentators. The ancient versions, however, the LXX., Peshitta and Targum correctly render יסוב,—a passive form—"it will be surrounded." The meaning of the verse then would be: The whole land, from Geba in the north to Rimmon in the south, and as far as the south of Jerusalem and Rama (Cp. Joshua xv. 32; xix. 7; Nehemiah xi. 29), will be surrounded, like the bed of the Jordan, with living waters which will flow out of Jerusalem. ראמה the LXX. rightly renders Ῥαμά the name of

Geba, not far from Michmash, was nine Roman miles (thirteen kilometres) north of Jerusalem; Rimmon was fifteen miles (twenty-two kilometres) distant from the capital in a southerly direction. According to Eusebius' *Onomastica,* perhaps the limit would reach a little further south, to Rama. This was the entire extent of Judæa when this prophecy was delivered. It corresponds pretty closely with the area of the country after the return from Babylon (Nehemiah xi. 25, *seq*). Before the Captivity, however, and immediately after the dissolution of the kingdom of Israel, the land of Judæa had a larger circumference (2 Kings xxiii. 9). The boundaries assigned to Judæa in this prophecy, therefore, clearly point to the post-Exilic period.

4. Chapter xiv. predicts that the desecrators of Jerusalem will be punished by a plague; a remnant, however, will escape, and will make an annual pilgrimage to the Holy City to celebrate the Feast of Tabernacles, in fellowship with the native citizens. Here we are given to understand that this festival was already celebrated by all the people of Judæa in solemn communion as a national institution. But this was far from being the case before the exile. The Book of Nehemiah tells us that, under Ezra for the first time, and, as a result of his instruction and exhortation, did the people erect booths on the Feast of Succoth. For, "since the days of Joshua, the son of Nun, unto that day, had not the children of Israel done so" (Nehemiah viii. 14-17). The passage in Zechariah referred to cannot, therefore, belong to pre-Exilic times. It must have originated in an age later even than that of Ezra and Nehemiah, when the precept to "dwell in booths" came to be generally observed.

a place. It refers to רֵאמֹת נֶגֶב (Joshua xix. 8 in some codices). In both passages the word is spelt with an א. A verb it cannot possibly be. Zech. xiv. 10 is to be connected with verse 8. They prophetically describe how the living water which will go forth from Jerusalem will surround the *whole* land, from Geba in the north to Rimmon and Rama (Ramath-Negeb) in the south.

5. Another argument leads to the conclusion that this chapter belongs to post-Exilic times. In the description of an earthquake, which would be sent as an omen of the relief of Jerusalem and its inhabitants, and would be followed by the universal recognition of Israel's God, the sentence occurs, "And the Lord, my God, shall come, and all the holy ones with him"[1] (Zech. xiv. 5). The "holy ones," who are to accompany God, can here and in all the Scriptures of the exilic and subsequent periods, only refer to angels. (See Job v. 1; xv. 15; Prov. ix. 10; xxx. 3; perhaps Ps. lxxxix. 6 and 8; in Dan. iv. 10, 14, 20, the angels are termed the "holy watchful ones.") It is now fully accepted that the figure of God, surrounded by a host of angels (Dan. vii. 10) was borrowed from the Persians, who gave their God of Light an escort of ministering spirits (Amesha-Spenta). This phrase too, then, indicates a late period for the fourteenth chapter.

The last chapter in the Book of Zechariah was, therefore, composed in the post-Exilic period. This hypothesis alone will explain the marked differences between it and the two chapters that immediately precede it. Those chapters, which assume the continuance of the House of David and the prevalence of idolatry, certainly belong to the period before the Exile, while the last chapter belongs to the period after it.

If, then, it is admitted that these two chapters have no connection with the last, which is to be assigned to an epoch later even than that of Ezra—on the ground that it speaks of the Feast of Tabernacles as an institution firmly rooted among the people, and universally observed by them —the exact date of this last chapter remains to be fixed. It must coincide with a time when the conquest of Jerusalem, and transportation of a portion of its inhabitants was considered imminent. For it is clear that the prophecy can neither refer to the conflict between the Jews and the

[1] The LXX., the Syriac version and the *Targum* read עמו כל קדשיו, and not עמך.

Samaritans, nor to the reigns of the first Persian kings, who were notoriously well disposed towards the Jews.

The prophet has a vision of a terrible catastrophe that is about to befall Judæa. He announces, at the same time, that its people will not all be carried into captivity. God himself will intervene with signs and wonders, which will convert the remnant of the nations who attack Jerusalem into true believers and fellow-celebrants of the Festival of Succoth. The narrative of Artaxerxes III.'s persecution of the Jews, and their partial banishment, determines the date of the prophecy.

This king, who, from a dread of usurpation, had executed all the members of the Persian royal house, and whom the Egyptians had contemptuously nicknamed "the donkey," threw off his lethargy, and set about strengthening the weak points in his extensive empire. Under his father, Artaxerxes II. (Mnemon), the satraps had governed their provinces with a slack hand, and public morals had also become loose. Egypt, with the aid of mercenary Hellenic leaders and traitorous satraps, had shaken off the Persian domination, and was again ruled by native sovereigns—Achoris, Nectanebo I., Tachus, and Nectanebo II. Against this last king, Artaxerxes Ochus undertook an expedition, with a number of warships, and an army consisting of 300,000 infantry and 30,000 cavalry. The various nationalities of his Asiatic empire, which extended to the confines of India, and the Greek cities and confederacies, all contributed their quota of troops. With these forces he reconquered Egypt, and reduced Phœnicia and Cyprus to submission. Diodorus Siculus describes this expedition in detail (xiii. 40), and gives its date as the second and third year of the 107th Olympiad (352-351 B.C.)

During this war Artaxerxes Ochus made Jewish prisoners, whom he re-settled in Hyrcanium. So Syncellus, or rather Eusebius, quoting the Greek historians, tells us in his chronicles. The campaign, commencing with the reduction of Phœnicia, and concluding with the subjugation of Egypt,

took place in the neighbourhood of Judæa. Paulus Orosius, who lived about a century after Eusebius, resided, like that Church Father, for some time in Palestine, and collected in 410 A.C., the history of ancient times, remarks that the Persian king's malevolence towards the Jews became manifest after his victory over the Egyptians.[1] We cannot, indeed, conceive it otherwise. While engaged with Egypt, Artaxerxes would hardly have troubled himself about Judæa. Only after the complete subjugation of the former land would he have turned his attention to the latter country.

What was the cause of his animosity against the Jews? About this we have no definite information. The people of Judæa, with their small extent of territory, would hardly have joined the Phœnicians and Egyptians in their revolt against Persian supremacy. The persecution possibly originated in an attempt to coerce *them to violate* their religious institutions, which was resisted.

Ctesias says that Artaxerxes II. introduced, as an innovation, the adoration of the Goddess of Pleasure (Anaitis-Anahida). Departing from the ancient customs of his country, he ordered that statues of this goddess should be set up and worshipped, not only in all the principal towns of Medo-Persia, but also in those of the annexed provinces, like Damascus and Sardis. Artaxerxes III. did not abolish this cult; for while the Persians of the fifth century, as Herodotus their contemporary tells us, had neither statues of their deities, nor temples, nor altars, their descendants in the next century possessed images of the twin-gods, *θεοὶ συμβώμοι*, Anaitis and Omanos, and a common altar dedicated to their service. Artaxerxes III. gave his support to the idolatry which his father had introduced.

[1] *Paulus Orosius, historiarum adversum paganos*, libri VII. (iii. 7). "Tenit etiam Ochus, qui est Artaxerxes, post transactum maximum diuturnumque bellum plurimos Judæos in trans-migrationem egit atque in Hyrcaniam ad Caspium mare habitare præcepit, quos ibi usque in hodiernum diem amplissimis generis sui incrementis consistere, atque enim quandoque erupturos opinio est.

Now, Pseudo-Hecatæus reports that the Persian kings tortured Jews, and put some of them to death, to force the nation to renounce their ancestral faith. These efforts proved abortive. This Jewish-Alexandrian writer cannot have invented this passage, he must have read it in some historical document. Only Artaxerxes II. and his son, Artaxerxes III., can here be intended; their predecessors were favourable to the Jews. The persecution probably only took place in the reign of the latter—Artaxerxes Ochus—who had the opportunity during his Egyptian campaign of observing the inhabitants of Judæa. Pseudo-Hecatæus possibly exaggerated the length of the persecution, and made it extend over several reigns, when it was really confined to one reign. At all events, there is sufficient data for accepting the narrative of the hostile treatment of the Jews by Artaxerxes in his Egyptian campaign.

Let us return to the prophecy at the end of the Book of Zechariah. It must have been delivered, orally or in writing, a considerable time after the epoch of Ezra and Nehemiah, and we are justified in assigning it to this reign. The prophet anticipated a deplorable fate for Jerusalem. He feared that the various nationalities who marched with Artaxerxes would gather round Jerusalem, capture and spoil the city, destroy houses, outrage women, and lead away half the inhabitants into captivity. He deemed it his duty to calm the people's minds by assuring them that the conquest of the capital would not involve the ruin of Judæa, nor the extinction of Judaism. The impending calamity was sent by the God of Israel, and would be followed by a universal conversion to Israel's faith: signs and wonders, testifying to God's power, would bring this result to pass. The majority of the besiegers would be destroyed. A remnant, however, would escape, acknowledge Jehovah as the one and only Sovereign of the Universe, and worship him under that name.[1] This rem-

[1] Zechariah xiv. 9. ה׳ אחד ושמו אחד, a phrase only occurring in this.

nant would celebrate the Feast of Tabernacles in communion with the inhabitants of Jerusalem.

Another proof that ch. xiv. of Zechariah belongs to Artaxerxes III.'s reign is the exceptional favour it accords to Egypt. The Egyptians are not counted among the nations who will attack Jerusalem, and will, therefore, not share in their punishment. This agrees with events under Artaxerxes Ochus. Egypt then enjoyed independence under Nectanebo, Egyptian troops did not march with the Persian hordes. As it had no part in the humiliation of Jerusalem, it would escape the penalty to be exacted for that offence, and would celebrate the Feast of Tabernacles in brotherly communion with the Jews. This prophetic passage should be assigned, accordingly, to the period of Artaxerxes III., and thus would confirm the narrative of that king's persecution of the Jews, given in other historical sources, which, in their turn, throw a flood of light upon this prophecy. The terrible fate, however, which the prophet had predicted for Jerusalem did not befall the capital. Some of the inhabitants—probably only distinguished families — were removed to Hyrcanium and Babylon. Levites were probably also banished about this time, as ch. xii. of Nehemiah seems to indicate.

This chapter furnishes a list of priests, beginning with Joshua, the son of Jozadak, who returned from Babylon, and ending with Jaddua, who officiated in the days of Darius Codomanus. The record covers a period of 200 years—538-338 B.C. Twenty-two other priestly families are further enumerated. Next, a complicated account of the Levitical families is given in three divisions מחלקות Singers, Gate-keepers, and Servitors. The same chapter

prophecy, is apparently intended to convey the idea that the principle of Monotheism was recognised by other peoples ; by the Persians, under the name of Ahura-Mazda ; and by the Greeks, in the post-Socratic period, under the name of Zeus. In the future, however, the converted nations would know and worship the one God as Jehovah, the name by which he was adored in Judæa. This will be the only name of God in general use.

says (ver. 22) that the heads of the priestly families were recorded from the time of Eliashib till Jaddua, *i.e.*, to the reign of Darius. The Levitical families, on the other hand, were only "written in the Book of the Chronicles till the days of Jochanan, the son of Eliashib" (ver. 23)—not down to the time of Jaddua and Darius. What does this difference import? Is not the inference a fair one, that the list of Levitical families was not as complete as that of the priestly families, because the former were banished, or had left the country of their own free will?

The following point, too, deserves attention. When the chronicler enumerates six generations of high priests, in their order of succession, down to his contemporary Jaddua, he gives a similar list of David's descendants, also in six generations, from Zerubbabel, who returned from exile with Joshua, the High Priest, to the representative of the royal seed in his own day (1 Chron. iii., 19-23). On the other hand, the Levitical families are only recorded to the time of the High Priest Jochanan, though the Chronicler shows as much partiality for them as for David's seed, and far more than for the families of the High Priests.

We can only account for the omission on the hypothesis that Levitical families, stricter observers of the Law than the families of the High Priests—as was made abundantly manifest during Ezra and Nehemiah's agitation against mixed marriages—were exiled by Artaxerxes Ochus, and transported to Hyrcanium on the Caspian Sea, during Jaddua's term of office, or in the last years of his predecessor, Jochanan. Between Artaxerxes' victory over Egypt, followed by the partial exile of the Jews in the year 351, and the war of Darius, the last Persian king, with Alexander the Great in 333, an interval of eighteen years elapsed. The Chronicler composed his tri-partite work—Ezra, Nehemiah, Chronicles—between 338, the year of Darius' accession, and 333, the date of the Perso-Macedonian War. During these years the High Priest Jaddua officiated under the Persian sovereignty. The Chronicler felt

that it would be irregular to include in his book the names of contemporary Levitical families, as the list of the heads of "the Levites" did not go further than the generation of Jochanan.

At first, it strikes one as strange that the Chronicler passes over in silence the partial banishment of his people, which occurred, too, in his day. But the difficulty vanishes when we consider the tendency of the Chronicles. The Chronicler's aim was not to write history. He does not mention one of the many noteworthy events that must have happened in the century after Nehemiah's death. He even passes over so tragic an incident as the fratricide in the Temple by a member of the High Priest's family. His interest centres mainly on three subjects: *The Royal House of David* (whose accession to the Messianic throne he awaited); *the Temple and its Ministrants;* and, finally, *the Genealogies* of the families that had kept free from Gentile alliances. Among the numerous episodes of post-Exilic times, he only selects three for recital; the erection of the Second Temple; the restoration of the ancient service; and the onslaught of Ezra and Nehemiah on foreign marriages. He omits to mention the building of the Samaritan Temple on Mount Gerizim, is satisfied with a bare reference to the banishment of Sanballat's son-in-law, though he was the son of a High Priest, and does not even trouble himself to give the name of the exile. All this will serve to diminish our surprise at the Chronicler's silence concerning the partial exile under Artaxerxes Ochus.

The omission in Josephus is stranger. He gives an account, in the Eleventh Book of his Antiquities, of the feud between the High Priest, Jochanan, and his brother, and its consequences under another Artaxerxes (*i.e., not* Artaxerxes I.). His history of the period, then, goes back as far as the year 359. Why does he not recount the sufferings that Jerusalem endured eight years later? This question, too, admits of an answer. Josephus's authority for the post-Exilic period was the "Apocryphal Ezra," an

ancient translation of a portion of Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah, with additions, partly legendary, which Josephus accepted as historical. His copy of Ezra went further than ours, which breaks off in the middle of a verse (ch. viii. 13). From this apocryphal work, Josephus derived his accounts of the quarrel in the family of the High Priest; of Sanballat; Manasseh, his son-in-law; Nikosa, Manasseh's wife; and of the building of the Samaritan Temple on Gerizim. Concerning none of these points does the Canonical Book of Nehemiah give a hint. If this apocryphal book reached only to Artaxerxes II.'s reign, the historian may have remained in ignorance of the subsequent events that took place under Artaxerxes III. The account of the transportation of inhabitants of Judæa, among them possibly Levites, by Artaxerxes III. to Hyrcanium and Babylon in 351, may therefore be historical. It is confirmed by the fact that all the sources state that those exiled to Hyrcanium settled on the Caspian coast, and that their descendants still live there.

I leave it to specialists in Biblical criticism and exegesis to determine whether the last chapter of Zechariah does indeed refer to the persecution of the Jews at this period.

II.—The Central Sanctuary of Deuteronomy.

The assumption, as far as I know, has hitherto been uncontested, that the Book of the Law discovered within the Temple, by the High Priest Hilkiah, in the days of King Josiah (and which occasioned the thorough-going reforms by that king), was the Book of Deuteronomy. Even the Talmud concedes this point. It states that the king was seized with fear when the newly-discovered book was read to him, and that it led to a change of opinions on his part, because the punishment of a king was therein predicted. This very threat of punishment occurs in Deuteronomy: "The Lord will transport thee and the king whom thou shalt set over thee amongst a nation unknown to thee."

As a result of this uncontested assumption, it is inferred that the Book of Joshua belongs to the same series, and that it is only a continuation of Deuteronomy; for in it is related how Joshua carried into effect the various precepts enjoined in Deuteronomy—the ordinance publicly to proclaim the blessing and the curse on Mounts Gerizim and Ebal respectively (Deut., ch. xi. 29, and ch. xxvii. 12; cp. Joshua, ch. viii. 33); the ordinance to write the contents of the law on stone "plaistered over with plaister" (Deut. ch. xxvii. 2; cp. Joshua, ch. viii. 32), where this law is actually called Deuteronomy, משנה תורת משה; the ordinance that an altar should be erected of unhewn stone near Shechem, in order that sacrifices should be offered up thereon (Deut., ch. xxvii. 8; cp. Joshua, ch. viii. 30); the injunction to read the law before the whole nation, and in the presence of women, children, and strangers (Deut., ch. xxxi. 11; cp. Joshua, ch. viii. 33); lastly, the injunction that the Levites should own forty-eight towns together with the precincts (Num., ch. xxxv. 7), which was also performed by Joshua. In fact, the books of Deuteronomy and Joshua are pervaded by a similar spirit, and are composed in the same style. The tendency of the latter book is to prove by facts that the ideal state depicted in Deuteronomy, as the consequence of obedience to the law of love of God, and of the unity of worship, was realised under Joshua, the result being that the people gained easy victories and conquered the land of Canaan.

The Book of Joshua, as an integral continuation of Deuteronomy, was considered by biblical critics as the sixth book of the law, which was therefore named the Hexateuch. This designation is, however, by no means appropriate. The book contains nothing of the chief subjects of the Pentateuch, namely Law, Instruction, and more particularly nothing of the law revealed to the people through Moses. But this is a side issue. Great stress is laid both in Deuteronomy and Joshua on one point which has not as yet been treated in its fullest importance, and

upon which it is the object of this essay to throw light. In both books reference is made to a future central sanctuary which was at the same time intended as the rallying point of the community. About twenty times in Deuteronomy mention is made of a locality to be chosen by the Lord, where he would permit his name to be sanctified. To this place were to be brought the sacrifices and tithes; there the festivals were to be observed, and judgments pronounced. To what topographical spot does this refer? Until now it has been assumed that both the books contained a veiled allusion to Jerusalem, as though this town had been predestined (before the entry into the land) to be the only Holy City. But this assumption is an error, and has only led to a misconception of the tendency of the two books.

In Deuteronomy it is commanded that, after the crossing of the Jordan, the tribes should erect an altar on the mountain near Shechem (it is for the moment unimportant whether Ebal or Gerizim was here meant), that they should bring thither live offerings and peace offerings, the latter of which they should eat in gladness (ch. xxvii. 5, 7). Thereby one of the heights of Shechem became consecrated as a place for worship. If Jerusalem had been referred to as the central sanctuary chosen by the Lord, it would have been in contradiction to this passage (ch. xxvii. 5), and would point to a rival place, whereas repeated allusion is made to the unity of worship.

If Jerusalem had been the chosen spot, then it would have been impossible to make offerings elsewhere, even at Shechem, and this not even once, on the occasion of the entry into the land.

In addition, it is related in Joshua (ch. viii. 30) that an altar was actually built on a mountain near Shechem, and that burnt offerings and peace offerings were brought there. We can here compare the ordinance regarding a place, which was still to be selected, with the one in which a height of Shechem is specially commanded for the

purpose.[1] These parallels clearly suggest that the height of Shechem was not only intended to be used as an altar for burnt-offerings on the one occasion of the entry into the land, but as the rallying spot for all times. In confirmation of this, it is related in Joshua (ch. xxiv. 25, 26) how the leader had made a treaty in Shechem with the inhabitants, how he inscribed the exhortation given by him in the "Book of the Law," and how a large stone was put up under a tree, which stood in the "Sanctuary of the Lord." This stone was to be considered as a memorial. From this it is incontestably evident that the altar referred to by the author of Deuteronomy, and spoken of in Joshua as having been actually erected, must have been the sanctuary in Shechem, and must have been considered as a *lasting sanctuary.*

If, then, a sanctuary was erected in Shechem, no allusion could have been intended to Jerusalem, as the one precludes the other.

If, according to Joshua, the town of Shechem, because of the sanctuary in its vicinity, became the actual central point of the land, as it is averred in Deuteronomy, it was a matter of course that Joshua, when near his end, should summon the elders of the tribes, and the chiefs to Shechem, and there exhort them, and at the same time make a solemn treaty with them (ch. xxiv. 1). In the Book of Joshua, moreover, Shechem is always considered to be the centre. Before this, and whilst the land was being sub-divided, Shiloh was regarded as the centre point (Joshua, ch. xviii. 1; ch. xxii. 12). There stood the Ark of the Covenant, which, however was not a place for sacrifices, nor was it intended for this purpose. Herein lies a harmonising tendency. It is an historical

[1] Deuter. xii. 5-7:—המקום אשר יבחר ה' ... והבאתם שמה עלתיכם וזבחיכם ... ואכלתם שם ... ושמחתם

Deuter. xxvii. 4-8:—ובנית שם [בהר עיבל] מזבח לה' אלהיך ... והעלית עליו עולת ... וזבחת שלמים ואכלת שם ושמחת

fact that Shiloh had previously been, and continued for some time to be, the central point, where stood the Ark of the Covenant until captured in the wars with the Philistines. This historical fact could not be ignored in the Book of Joshua. Consequently it was only after the entry into the land, and because the Ark of the Covenant was kept at Shiloh, that this town became a holy meeting-place for worship! And yet Shechem is said to have been designated as the central point, and to have actually been consecrated for that purpose.

This contradiction the Book of Joshua wished to eliminate by the assertion that Shiloh was only the resting-place of the Ark of the Covenant, and a provisional meeting-place in the beginning; whilst, on the other hand, Shechem was chosen as the *permanent* centre after order had been established, because it was in the immediate vicinity of the sanctuary. The distinction conferred upon Shechem both in Deuteronomy and in Joshua was, in fact, a mere desiderium. As, however, it is stated in the latter book that the choice of the town was a historical fact, it became necessary to explain the relations existing between Shiloh and Shechem.[1]

Kleinert, the champion of Deuteronomy, has justly remarked that this book contains no trace of an allusion to Jerusalem, but he is wrong in his other assertion that the position of the place to be chosen by the Lord "was not definitely decided, but was left in uncertainty." From the foregoing it will be seen that the place was clearly designated as "a mountain in the neighbourhood of the town of Shechem." It is also intelligible why in Deuteronomy the mountains around this town have a special purpose,

[1] It is to be noted that the site of the Ark of the Covenant was not in consequence considered as a central place for worship. David had appointed a place for the Ark of the Covenant in Zion, but the spot was not thereby constituted as a place for offerings; Solomon did not offer sacrifices in Zion, but in Gibeon, because that was the great high place (1 Kings iii. 4).

and why in the Book of Joshua this purpose is carried into effect, Gerizim being appointed for the announcement of the blessing, and Ebal being intended for the proclamation of a curse. Why should just this mountain near Shechem be chosen? Why should not that of Zion or Moriah, near Jerusalem, be selected for the blessing? Because it was intended to fix the central sanctuary in Shechem.[1] For the same reason these mountains are described with minute detail. "They lie on the western side of the Jordan, near the oaks of Moreh." As a matter of course Gerizim, the mountain from which the blessing was to be proclaimed, was also named as the spot on which an altar should be built, and which was chosen by the Lord, and where, according to Joshua, an altar was actually erected. The substitution of Ebal for the intended locality was effected during the time of animosity between the Judæans and Samaritans. Mount Gerizim was to be chosen as the central place for worship. It certainly seems surprising that in these two books, Jerusalem—otherwise characterised as "the Holy City," "the City of God," and where the magnificent temple of Solomon is called the "Pride of Jacob"—should have been degraded in favour of Shechem, and a simple altar on Gerizim. But this point belongs to the radical reforms which Deuteronomy desired to introduce. It cannot be denied that the prophets in the time of

[1] Owing to the Greek translator, this circumstance has remained obscure. It seemed to him a contradiction that Shechem should be a centre as well as Shiloh. He therefore altered the text, and (Joshua, ch. xxiv. 1) ויאסף יהושע שכמה is given as εἰς Σηλώ; so too (xxiv. 25) וישם לו חוק ומשפט בשכם is translated ἐν Σηλώ, with the addition ἐνώπιον τῆς σκηνῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ Ἰσραήλ. As, however, in the following verse another sanctuary is spoken of which could not have been in Shiloh, the translator omitted the words במקדש, and again put ἀπέναντι κυρίου. In this manner the contradiction was to be eliminated. On the other hand, the Syrian translation in all these verses has שכם, as also has the Vulgate. In the Complutensian and Aldine edition similarly Συχέμ stands in place of Σηλώ. This variant is used because of the Hebrew text, for originally Shilo must have occurred in the Septuagint as the Vetus Itala also has "Silo."

King Josiah felt a deep abhorrence for Jerusalem and its temple on account of the abominations perpetrated there. The prophet Zephaniah calls Jerusalem the polluted and corrupted city (ch. iii. 1), because her rulers "resemble roaring lions, her judges ravening wolves of the desert, and her priests desecrate the sanctuary and falsify the law" (ch. iii. 4).

Deuteronomy refers in words of the curse to the revolting deeds prevalent at that time. Idol worship, contempt for parents, removal of landmarks, miscarriage of justice towards strangers, widows and orphans, these were the least sins; the moral turpitude went so far as to permit the indulgence of sodomy, secret murders, and the bribing of judges. Further, there were sacrifices of children in the vale of Hinnom. Jeremiah cried, "Search through the streets of Jerusalem and see in the broad places thereof if ye can find one man that executeth judgment and that seeketh the truth" (ch. v. 1). A psalmist of the time complains of Jerusalem, "I see oppression and hate go about in the city; they surround her walls, and from her streets deceit and falsehood do not depart" (Ps. lv. 9, 10). The temple was utterly desecrated, altars for star-worship were placed in the fore-courts and even in the inner parts of the temple, and an image of the vile goddess Astarte, named סמל, was erected and attended by temple wardens; even the priests of Aaron were so corrupt as to take part in horrible idolatry. There were also foreign priests (Khemarim), who probably initiated the others into the rites of idol worship.[1] Therefore, Jeremiah places in the mouth of the Lord these words respecting Jerusalem: "For this city hath been to me as a provocation of mine anger and of my fury, from the day that they built it over unto this day" (Jer. xxxii. 31). In the eyes of these prophets, Jerusalem and the Temple were vile on account of the

[1] 2 Kings ch. xxi. 3; ch. xxiii. 4-12; Zephaniah, ch. i. 4; Jeremiah, ch. vii. 30, 31.

abominations performed there. Ezekiel received a prophetic direction to hold up to Jerusalem the mirror of her evil doings, and the reader feels a shudder at the description of such depths of moral and religious degradation (Ez. xvi. and xxii.). Of Jerusalem, during this period, we can say with Isaiah: "How has the faithful city become a harlot"; and with Ezekiel of the Temple of Solomon: "It has become like unto a sink." The later prophets, Jeremiah, and even more so Ezekiel (who spoke after Josiah's regeneration of his kingdom, and who had witnessed its retrogression into its former corrupt condition), prophesied the destruction of Jerusalem and of the Temple, and in fact of the whole country, because of its irreclaimable vices. Zephaniah, who spoke before the regeneration of the kingdom, cherished optimistic hopes of an improvement. He lived in expectation of a complete revolution (such as the invasion by the Scythians), in which the degraded and haughty nobles would be destroyed, and only the poor and lowly would be spared. This remnant would not use force, would not utter deceit and falsehood, and therefore would be protected by God, and Zion would be cleansed from the wicked, and would once more rejoice (Zeph. iii. 8-17). According to Zephaniah, Jerusalem still had a bright future.

The book of Deuteronomy points to another solution of Zephaniah's optimism and Ezekiel's pessimism with regard to the future of Jerusalem. It was not expected that a favourable change would occur in the inhabitants of Jerusalem, but as the result of a radical reformation; Jerusalem, which was thoroughly corrupt, would cease to be the capital, and the polluted temple would no longer be the place of religious worship. In its stead would be Shechem and Mount Gerizim. There the altar should be erected for peace and burnt-offerings (no other offerings were to be permitted); there the tribes were to assemble on the festivals, and together with the poor were to partake in joyous gladness of the burnt-offerings

and tithes, and there the chief judge or priest of the tribe of Levi should hold judgment. A king was to be installed, but one who was worthy, who would be humble and not fond of pomp, and who would take the new book of the law as his guide.

Now, as Joshua, after the conquest of the land and according to the directions of Moses his master, had erected an altar on Mount Gerizim, it thereby (having been chosen by the Lord) became consecrated to the Lord. The Deuteronomist hoped for a thorough-going improvement from the fact that the sanctuary was to be removed from the sin-laden city of Jerusalem and from its desecrated temple, especially as effect was to be given to the new Book of the law which Moses imparted to his people shortly before his death, and delivered into the keeping of the Levites, and which imposed nothing difficult of execution.

If the nation was to continue to exist, it was necessary that Jerusalem should be deprived of its pre-eminence. This is decidedly the tendency of the Book of Deuteronomy. Jerusalem and Moriah were to be degraded, and Shechem and Gerizim to become the central place for worship. This is the fundamental idea of Deuteronomy and its appendage the Book of Joshua. Ezekiel followed on precisely the same lines. In the restoration predicted by him, all the tribes were to have equal territories. Dan in the north and Gad in the south; between these the remaining tribes, and in the centre Judah and Benjamin. The capital and the sanctuary were to be in the middle of the land, in the midst of the country, unlike Jerusalem, which was situated in the south. This arrangement shows that the prophet did not incline to the view of a restoration of Jerusalem, and that he knew Shechem was destined to replace it. The centre, between the northern boundary, in a line with Damascus, and the southern boundary in a line with the southern point of the Dead Sea; this was the centre where in the future the capital, to be named Yahveh-Shamah, and the sanctuary were to be placed. These points

were to meet in the central zone of the district of Ephraim. Like Ezekiel, the Deuteronomist desired that the polluted and desecrated city of Jerusalem should be degraded.

He impressed on King Josiah to give up Jerusalem, and to make Shechem the capital. By this means an improvement might take place, and the fall of the whole country be averted. This project was not entirely Utopian. The territory which had formerly belonged to the tribes of Manasseh and Ephraim, and which had been the chief possession of the kingdom of Ten Tribes (Shechem-Samaria), had in consequence of the Scythian invasion, been freed from Assyrian tribute. Josiah seems also to have claimed it as his heritage, for he refused to the Egyptian King Necho a passage through the plain of Jezreel, whereby he met his death near Megiddo. Josiah, therefore, had considered Shechem as his possession. Further, the town, on account of its position and fertility, was far more suitable as a centre than Jerusalem. If the Book of Deuteronomy designed to substitute Gerizim for Moriah and Shechem for Jerusalem, the author of the book could not possibly have been a priest of Jerusalem, nor the High Priest Hilkiah, as it is highly improbable that such a man would have written *contra domum.* Least of all could the author have been Jeremiah, who, despite the corruption of the capital, still hoped that through an improved state of things Jerusalem and the temple would continue to exist (Jer. xvii. 24-27; xxxi. 38-40). It is more likely that the author was one of the sons of Zadok, who took no part in the idolatrous horrors of the temple, and were, therefore, deposed from their office from the time of Manasseh until Josiah's reformation (Ez. xliv. 15). In Ezekiel, Deuteronomy, and Joshua, those sons of Zadok are called *Levitical priests,* in contradistinction to the foreign priests, who were not of the tribe of Levi. It was only these Levitical or Zadokite priests that were considered in Deuteronomy to be worthy to carry the Ark of the Covenant (Deut. ch. xxxi. 9; Joshua, ch.

iii. 3-6; ch. iv. 10), whilst in Numbers it is not the priests but the Levites of the family Kehath, who are appointed to carry the ark. To these Levites who had remained faithful, the Book of Deuteronomy was intrusted (ch. xxxi. 25, 26). The king was to have a copy made of the book in their possession (ch. xvii. 18), so that it could only have been compiled for them and their circle. The High Priest, Hilkiah, who found the book in the Temple, certainly did not belong to the Zadokite priests, as he officiated without scruple in the desecrated temple. He had no conception of the overwhelming nature of its contents when the book was discovered. With the changed site of the sanctuary, a change in its attendants was to take place, for thus only the imminent fall could be averted. Instead of the priests who had taken part in the abominations in the temple of Jerusalem, and who had thereby become defiled and debased like the foreign priests, and also instead of the sons of Abiathar, the sons of Zadok were to officiate in the transferred sanctuary. The Levitical priests were to be the guardians of the sanctuary. Ezekiel borrowed this means of improvement from Deuteronomy.

To these worthy priests, sons of Zadok, Deuteronomy prescribes a simple mode of life. For the priests of those days owned fields, as is shown for example in the case of Jeremiah's cousin (Jeremiah, ch. xxxii. 7), and probably also in the case of other priests of Anathoth, who did not belong to the Zadokites, and who hated the prophet because he censured their abuses. The gifts from the people to the Levites would be very meagre. They consisted in inferior pieces of the sacrifices and a small part, *not the tenth*, of the grain, wine, and oil harvest, nor of the wool-shearing, nor the first-born of the flock, nor the better portions of the sacrifices, which had doubtless been assigned to them by the ancient Pentateuchal Laws. It appears that Deuteronomy is intended to react against the excessive number of sacrifices and against the luxurious display of the temple,

or even against a temple at all. The place for worship on Mount Ebal (Gerizim) was simply to consist of an altar of unhewn stone. Whether it was intended that a closed space or house should be near the altar is not clearly expressed; only once is a "house of God" mentioned (Deut., ch. xxiii. 19), and this may only have been a figure of speech for a place of worship.

The Ark of the Covenant, which contained the books of the law, was to be made of shittim wood (ch. x. 1-3), without being covered with gold, or with a gold lid as if to show that the Deuteronomical Law laid weight on simplicity and the avoidance of ostentation in the projected form of religious worship. Thus Deuteronomy, too, contains no word with reference to the splendid garments of the priests, on which such great stress is laid in Exodus and Leviticus.

Considered from this point of view Deuteronomy appears as a work marked by unity of purpose, wherein the various component parts—historical reminiscences, exhortations, and ordinances—cohere, and dovetail into one another. Any attempt to tear these component parts asunder betrays a want of comprehension of the true tendency of the book.

H. GRAETZ.